

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 3 have been amended. Claims 18-21 are new. Basis for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by prior art admitted by Applicant. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 1 has been amended to define the first and second power supply terminals as being connected to the same terminal of the external power supply. Claim 3 has been amended to define that the power supply terminal of the package is connected with one terminal of the external power supply and that the first and second power-supply-purpose pads are connected to the power supply terminal of the package and thus to one terminal of the external power supply.

Applicants admitted prior art discloses a first and a second terminal (8 and 5) but each of these terminals is connected to a separate terminal of the external power supply. The admitted prior art does not disclose a first and second terminal (pad) connected to the same terminal of the external power supply.

Thus, Applicant believes that Claims 1 and 3, as amended, patentably distinguish over the prior art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over prior art admitted by Applicant. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection by the Examiner. Claims 2 and 4 have first and second output terminals for connection with a terminal of the external load. Thus, the terminal of the external load is connected to two separate portions of the integrated circuit (on the chip). This is not mere duplication of essential working parts as stated by the Examiner. In St. Regis Paper Co. v Bemis Co., 193 USPQ8, the court found that the addition of multiple plies to a bag is duplication of parts. Here, the first terminal (first output-purpose pad) is connected to the switching element and the second terminal (second output-purpose pad) is connected to an impedance circuit. Thus, the two terminals (output-purpose pads) are not duplication of essential working parts because of the fact that they are connected to different elements of the integrated circuit device.

Thus, Applicants believe Claims 2 and 4 patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 21, 2003

By:


Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg